



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,616	04/14/2005	Sebastiaan Antonius Franciscus Arnoldus Van Den Heuvel	NL 021072	8187
24737 7590 02/06/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER ARANI, TAGHI T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2131

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

F

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/531,616

Applicant(s)

VAN DEN HEUVEL ET AL.

Examiner

Taghi T. Arani

Art Unit

2131

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/1/4/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/23/06, 4/20/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined and are pending.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement filed 4/20/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 21-22 are not limited to tangible embodiments. The terms "signal comprising" and "Computer program product..." are not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments and intangible embodiments (e.g., transmission medium). As such, the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter and are therefore non-statutory.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-10, 15-16, 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0123109 to Choi.

As per claim 1, 18-19 and 21, Choi teaches a method, system, signature device and signal for providing data integrity authentication and data protection, in which a set of data fragments is protected by a signature (Abstract, Fig. 6 and associated text, paragraph 0045, Fig. 1 and associated text) characterized in that each data fragment of the set comprises its own unique identifier (Fig. 6, item 630, metadata digest information for selected fragment data, see also paragraph 0045), the signature comprises references to the respective unique identifiers of the data fragments of the set (paragraph 0059-0060, and 0077, where pointer information indicating a relationship between each of the plurality of metadata (unique

Art Unit: 2131

identifier) fragment data and its corresponding metadata digest information and metadata authentication signature are disclosed, see also paragraph 0077, where in the case of a SOAP message –level authentication, authentication information is included in the header of a SOAP message together with a pointer for part of the metadata contained in the body of the SOAP message, see also paragraphs 0076 and 0078)).

**As per claim 2**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which the set is protected by multiple signatures, and in which the multiple signatures can originate from different sources (Fig. 3, metadata authentication information comprising first, second, etc. authentication signature information, see also paragraphs 0039-0040).

**As per claim 3**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which for each data fragment a hash is generated and the hashes of the data fragments of the set are used to compute the signature (paragraphs 0056-57 and paragraph 0040, where metadata container-level container authentication information are hash values).

**As per claim 4**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which the data fragments are expressed in XML (paragraphs, 0031, 0047 and 0076, where each metadata transmission packet has a binary format such as binary XML format).

**As per claim 5**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which the data fragments constitute TV-Anytime metadata (paragraph 0076).

**As per claim 6**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which the signature is stored according to the xmldsig standard (paragraph 0074 and 0076, where authenticated metadata fragment using SOAP message is disclosed).

**As per claim 9**, hoi teaches he method according to claim 1, in which the references are also protected by the signature (paragraph 0077, where in the case of a SOAP message – level authentication, authentication information is included in the header of a SOAP message together with a pointer for part of the metadata contained in the body of the SOAP message, see also paragraphs 0076 and 0078).

**As per claim 10**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, in which at least one signature index file is added (paragraph 0044, se also claim 37).

**As per claim 15**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 4, in which the signature is included in an XML document (Fig. 4 and Fig. 11 including associated texts).

**As per claim 16**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 4, in which the signature is provided in a wrapper XML document, comprising the original XML data document ((paragraph 0077, where in the case of a SOAP message –level authentication, authentication information is included in the header of a SOAP message together with a pointer for part of the metadata contained in the body of the SOAP message, see also paragraphs 0076 and 0078).

**As per claim 20**, Choi teaches verification device (10) for verifying data integrity authentication and data protection, the device being arranged to handle data fragments, the

Art Unit: 2131

device being arranged to verify a signature to protect a set of data fragments ((paragraphs 0051-0052, Fig. 7 and associated text, where the process of verifying the received metadata container by generating the metadata digest information), characterized in that the device is arranged to address each data fragment to be protected by a unique identifier included in the data fragment, and the device is arranged to verify signature information comprising the unique identifiers to refer to the data fragments of the set. (paragraphs 0053-0054).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 7 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of “A method to process XML document with preserving their representation”, IBM technical Disclosure Bulletin, October 2001, UK (hereinafter, “IBM TD”)

While Choi teaches standard description of metadata access and usage rights and implementation thereof using XrML, XACMI, or SAMI (paragraph 0076), Choi does not disclose but IBM TD discloses “a cannolization function...used before generating the signature” and/or “transform function on a superset of data fragments (IBM, TD, page 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of IBM TD into the method and system of Choi's XML signature in order to avoid the problem caused by digital signature on XML document and to create a standard or canonical representation before computing a digital signature.

7. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 2002/0038352 to Ashley.

**As per claims 11 and 12**, Choi discloses the method according to claim 1, except in which the unique identifier in a particular data fragment starts with a unique identification of an organization that generated the particular data fragment, in which the unique identification is the DNS name of the organization.

However, in an analogous art, Ashley discloses that in TV-Anytime technology (paragraph 0005) content identifiers (Fig. 4 and associated text, CRID's) include Authority names (the organizations that create CRID's), each one uniquely identified by a name and TV-Anytime standard uses the DNS name registration system to ensure that these names are unique (see also paragraph 0030).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Ashley into the method and system of Choi's metadata integrity, authentication and protection to have the unique identifier start with a unique identification of the organization that generated the particular data fragment such as the DNS name of the organization in conformance with the TV-Anytime standard to allow a user to find the



Art Unit: 2131

content they want regardless of time and location where the content can be acquired ( paragraph 0004)

**As per claim 13**, Choi teaches the method according to claim 1, except in which the reference is accompanied by a location indicator that indicates the location of the data fragment the reference refers to.

However in and analogous art, Ashley (paragraphs 0004-0005, Fig. 4 and associated text) teaches that in TV-Anytime technology a CRID in which a unique Authority name embedded resolves the time and location of the content (see also paragraph 0029).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Ashley into the method and system of Choi's metadata integrity, authentication and protection in which reference is accompanied by a location indicator that indicates the location of the data fragment the reference refers to, in order to allow a user to find the content they want regardless of time and location where the content can be acquired (paragraph 0004).

**As per claim 14**, Choi does not teach but Ashley teaches in which the location indicator indicates the path through the data to the referenced data fragment (paragraph 0040-0050).

The Examiner supplies the same rationale for the combination of Choi-Ashley as provided in claim 13 above.

Art Unit: 2131

8. Claim 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 2003/0093678 to Bowe et al. (hereinafter "Bowe").

As per claim 17, Choi teaches the method according to claim 4, except in which the XML signature provided in a separate XML document, referring to the original XML data document.

However, in an analogous art, Bowe teaches XML signature provided in a separate XML document, referring to the original XML data document (paragraph 0059, where signed object can have a detached signature and when the signed object contains the signature and the address of the data object).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Bowe in the method and system of Choi to have a separate XML signature, referencing the original XML data document so that compromise of one does not result in the generation of unintended signatures (Bowe, paragraph 0034).

#### **Conclusion**

9. Prior arts made of record, not relied upon:

Please see attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taghi T. Arani whose telephone number is (571) 272-3787. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Taghi T. Arani, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2131  
2/1/2007